



City of Columbus  
Mayor Michael B. Coleman

# University Area Review Board

109 North Front Street, First Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9031  
(614) 645-6096 (614) 645-1483 fax

## MEETING SUMMARY

date  
place  
time

**December 16, 2010**  
**Northside Branch Library**  
**1423 North High Street**  
**6:30pm**

**A.**

motion

**Approval of Meeting Summary**

**No Meeting Summary to approve**

**B.**

**1.**

applicant:  
to be reviewed:  
**6:30**

**Applications for Certificate of Approval**

**2685 North High Street**  
Darrin Gray (Sign Vision, Inc.)  
pricing sign relocation

**Turkey Hill**

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Gray discussed the need to relocate the pricing signs to make them visible to drivers. Mr. Goodman inquired where the signs would be located. Mr. Gray stated that the preferred locations were below the eave on the South Elevation of the Southeast corner of the building and on the portion of the wall above the eave on the West Elevation Southwest corner. Mr. Gray reiterated that the signs are merely be relocated, they are not new signs. The Board and applicant discussed alternate locations. Mr. Kane stated that he could support the relocations, but they should be placed below the roof eave. Mr. Gray stated that there are many obstacles in the way that would obscure the sign on the West Elevation. Mr. Goodman and Mr. Horne acknowledged that may be true but locating the sign higher would not necessarily mean more visibility. Mr. Horne asked whether it would be more appropriate to be located on the landscape wall or on a separate wall prior to the curb cut. Mr. Ferdelman stated that the option was discussed at the last meeting as being the optimal situation, but for cost. Motion made. Mr. Gray asked whether the Board could grant the motion to allow locating the sign above the eave. Mr. Goodman stated that Board was not favorable to the idea.

motion

motion by  
vote

**To approve the application for a relocating two existing pricing signs on the condition:**  
• **That both signs are placed below the eave of the roof at the same height.**

**Mr. Kane / Ms. Uhas-Sauer**  
**6-0 to Approve**

<b>2.</b> applicant: to be reviewed: <span style="color: red;">~ 6:45</span>	<b>1546 North High Street</b> Steve Cohee (Owner), Mr. (Capital City Awning) patio enclosure	<b>Ugly Tuna Saloon</b>
---	--	-------------------------

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Cohee described the changes to the proposal; two ideas about the vertical panels could be located – in front of the column or behind. Mr. Kane asked for clarification about how the panel meets the floor. The applicant described an eight inch curb that the vertical panel would be hooked to. The Board and applicant discussed details. Mr. Cohee stated that he believed the panels on the outside would be a cleaner design. Mr. Grado declared that he was opposed to mounting the panel on the outside. Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked about the intended period of use. Mr. Cohee stated that he would most likely use the enclosure from November to March, other times it would be rolled up into the roof structure. Several Board members expressed the concern that the panels could not be rolled up and into the roof structure if the panels are mounted on the front of the columns. Mr. Grado asked whether they had considered building a bar rail to attach the panel at the bottom. Mr. Cohee returned that that would mean a reduction of about 10”-12” all around the patio. Mr. Goodman affirmed that the consensus was that back mounting of the vertical panel maintains the architectural qualities of the patio and building. Mr. Goodman entertained a motion. Mr. Cohee pleaded that he could not afford to lose any space on the patio. Mr. Horne explained how the tracks on front of the columns would be a distraction, and as mentioned earlier the panels if rolled up on the front could not be concealed a discussed. Mr. Graver stated that the drawings are lacking in detail and specifically the drawing does not show the track on the columns as should be there. Mr. Cohee stated that this proposal is his last try. Mr. Goodman acknowledged Mr. Cohee situation but stated that the UARB is here to consider the effects of this proposal on the building's aesthetics. Mr. Cohee expressed interest in pursuing the modified enclosure.

motion	<b>To approve the proposal as submitted with the following conditions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>That the vertical panels be mounted to the rear of the column as illustrated by Exhibit ‘B’</b></li> <li>• <b>That revised and further detailed drawings be submitted to staff for approval.</b></li> </ul>
motion by vote	<b>Mr. Kane / Mr. Grado</b> <b>6-0 to Approve</b>

<b>3.</b> applicant: to be reviewed: <span style="color: red;">~ 7:00</span>	<b>1470 Neil Avenue</b> Mike Stickney (North Steppe Realty) deck and stairs	<b>Rooming House</b>
---	---	----------------------

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Stickney explained that the rooming house was recently acquired and needs to be remodeled, including three bedrooms; the deck is a way to improve egress. Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked whether it was changing from rooming house to apartments. Mr. Stickney confirmed that it would remain a rooming house. Mr. Goodman stated that he was having a hard time understanding the drawings and the site plan is missing. Ms. Uhas-Sauer asked whom it was purchased from. Mr. Stickney stated that he bought it from the Tibbels, it is known as the Holiday House. The Applicant and Board discussed the drawings. Mr. Grado requested additional details regarding material and composition. Mr. Horne suggested pulling the stairs back. Mr. Kane questioned whether the stairs needed to be covered per building code. Ms. Uhas-Sauer requested that the applicant come back to the Board to discuss all the other buildings as a whole. Ms. Uhas-Sauer also expressed concern about the bedrooms in the basement. Mr. Stickney stated that the building is a licensed rooming house, so it does have additional review by the City. Mr. Goodman stated that a site plan is required, a better drawing of the deck and handrails, and a side elevation including the stairs. Mr. Horne asked why the deck had to continue around to the recessed door, the catwalk structure seemed ill fitting.

notes	<b>Things to consider:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site Plan</b></li> <li>• <b>Additional notes regarding materials and composition.</b></li> <li>• <b>Drawings that show how it will actually look.</b></li> </ul>
-------	---

<b>4.</b> applicant: to be reviewed: ~ 7:15	<b>2406 North High Street</b> Dick Bigham (Sign Erector), Dina Cherney (SignGlo) wall sign	<b>Wireless Way</b>
--	--	---------------------

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Ms. Cherney asked whether opaque colors are now the requirement. Mr. Ferdelman stated that the sign backgrounds could be white but with opaqueing film on the back face. The Board and Applicant discussed the appropriate size and location of the sign. The Board and applicant discussed the nature of all the signs in the center. Ms. Uhas-Sauer

motion   motion by vote	<b>To approve the proposal as submitted with the following conditions:</b> • <b>That the white background shall be opaque</b>  <b>Mr. Horne / Ms. Uhas-Sauer</b> <b>6-0 to Approve</b>
-------------------------------------	--

<b>5.</b> applicant: to be reviewed: ~ 7:30	<b>36 Norwich Avenue</b> Barry Jardine (Architect), Wayne Garland (Owner), Joe Lewis (Engineer) conceptual review	<b>Buckeye Real Estate Office</b>
--	---	-----------------------------------

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Goodman asked for more accurate drawings, the drawings should reflect the true dimensions of the products that have been selected. Mr. Goodman commented that Mr. Jardine needs to draw it the way it is going to look, otherwise the proposal is worthy of conceptual approval. Mr. Kane mentioned that the addition is probably too stark, it should be more residential. Mr. Graver asked about the metal vertical siding. Mr. Lewis could not speak to the material selection. Mr. Horne suggested the front face of the addition be placed behind the existing entrance. Mr. Ferdelman stated that the BZA case allows them to add the 7', also the existing building already is in front of the entry. Mr. Horne requested additional drawings on the entryway as a condition.

motion	<b>Things to consider</b> • <b>Information on the doors and windows</b> • <b>Several sections through the building</b> • <b>Additional drawings on the entrance way</b>
--------	--

<b>6.</b> applicant: to be reviewed: ~ 7:45	<b>East 15<sup>th</sup> &amp; 16<sup>th</sup> Avenues</b> Brian Kinzelman (KKG, Inc.); Allan Lupton (Lupton Rausch Architects); Mike Shannon, Rita Martin (CBJ, LLP); Pete Edwards, Ryan Szymanski (Edwards Companies) development proposal, conceptual review	<b>The Province (Multi-Family Residences)</b>
--	---	---

Mr. Ferdelman presented several slides and reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Shannon explained the necessity of the variances for use (CV) on the office/residential building and the variances from development standards (BZA) for the two larger buildings. Mr. Shannon recounted an earlier request for development text and described their response. Mr. Kinzelman explained the project scope and its setting in the neighborhood, including a 3D computer model. Mr. Kinzelman discussed the development numbers; 445 beds, 238 parking spaces, 0.5 cars per bed. Mr. Lupton explained the changes to the buildings in terms of height, massing and articulation as a reaction to the comments from the UARB and other community organizations.

Ms. Uhas-Sauer expressed her concern of a conflict of interest, in that Columbus Landmarks receives funding from the Edwards Companies and the fact that she is the current President and Mr. Kane's wife is the Executive Director. Mr. Ferdelman stated that it was his opinion that neither Ms. Uhas-Sauer or Mr. Kane were personally profiting from the donations, nor were they employed or directly contracted to or by the Edwards Companies. Mr. Goodman stated that in the realm of Development and Architecture, these relationships will exist. Mr. Ferdelman stated that it is quite possible that many past and future applicants are members or have donated to Columbus Landmark. Mr. Grado asked if the applicants were requesting a vote; Mr. Shannon said yes. Mr. Goodman stated that should Mr. Kane & Ms. Uhas-Sauer recuse themselves the Board would be at quorum and the applicant would need to get an affirmative vote from the four (4) remaining Board members. Mr. Goodman asked to poll the Board. Mr. Grado stated that he would vote against approval of the variances. Mr. Goodman stated that if Mr. Kane and Ms. Uhas-Sauer recused themselves, an affirmative motion would fail.

Mr. Grado asked whether a discussion of the project was possible. Mr. Goodman stated that he would open up the meeting for comments. Mr. Grado commended the applicants for working to improve the site, massing and aesthetics of the project, but the review of the project at this point was for the Zoning. Mr. Grado commented on the BZA request; he first explained the reasons for the University Area Planning Overlay; he stated that the current request is for four (4) times the allowable density (2.4 FAR versus 0.6 FAR) per the Overlay. Mr. Grado described another project that originally came in at 1.5 FAR and the Board was able to get the project negotiated with the Developer to a 0.8 FAR and the project that did get built. Mr. Grado raised objection to the proposed parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per bed when the Overlay requires closer to 1.0 space per bed; he relayed an experience with Evans Scholars where the variance for parking reduction has resulted in an arraignment for additional parking off site with a neighboring property at almost the exact number of spaces that were granted by the variance. Mr. Grado stated that the project of this size has a large impact on the infrastructure that is not accounted for in the proposal, with traffic and parking being the most visible and obvious. Mr. Grado expressed that the prospective students would not need cars to go to the University, they would need cars to go to jobs or entertainment. Mr. Graver praised the changes to the site and buildings but also expressed concern over the parking though was not as concerned about the overall size of the proposal. Mr. Horne stated that the density of people that would occupy the buildings is not an issue, the related parking and traffic become a problem for the developer, and it cannot be solved by creating more surface parking lots. Mr. Horne expressed concern over the sense of separation (or elitism) created by elevated and gated courtyards requiring a swipe card. Mr. Goodman spoke to the connections between Mr. Kane, Ms. Uhas-Sauer and the Edwards Company; he stated that welcomed the disclosure but did not believe the relationship to be a conflict of interest. Mr. Ferdelman concurred but also offered to discuss the matter with the City Attorney's office. Ms. Uhas-Sauer commented that if one could divorce the density from the parking there would be no issue with the proposal, except for the usual architectural treatments. Ms. Uhas-Sauer expressed some concern over the expected use of the certified or affiliated housing designation, the University seems to be pulling away from the policy. Ms. Uhas-Sauer thanked the applicants for addressing concerns through the design process and that the design itself has many positive attributes. Mr. Kane complimented the applicants for the response to concerns and for the level of design; he stated that of all site locations, this location probably would be more appropriate to receive such density, but it is not correct to expect the students to use less cars than other students do. Mr. Kane stated that the applicants could go down further to add parking, at a significant cost albeit. Mr. Goodman complemented the architecture, he stated he was not troubled by the density or the parking. Mr. Goodman asked for the parking ratio per unit. Mr. Kinzelman responded that it would equate to 1.5 spaces per unit. Mr. Goodman equated that the proposed parking is what is required in other parts of the City. Mr. Ferdelman responded that the Zoning in the rest of the city is based on the assumption of a nuclear family, not a mix of unrelated individuals. Mr. Goodman stated that it is the Developer that will have the most to lose if they are not able to lease up the buildings due to the lack of parking.

Mr. Szymanski responded that while the Edwards Company has yet to build in such a dense neighborhood, the research from other similar locations next to Universities suggests that a parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per bed is sufficient. Mr. Szymanski stated that the their development at Lane Avenue has a parking ratio of 0.6 spaces per unit and they are not finding it difficult to lease. Mr. Szymanski elicited that the traffic study did account for traffic flows at all points during the day and some at night and the mitigations in the design of the road should address the congestion at peak hours. Mr. Grado reported that all the data points to the reality the parking needs in the University District are one space to each bed regardless of the conditions of other cities. Mr. Grado stated that currently there are more parking permits issued for 15th and 16th than there are actual spaces, every resident in the proposed buildings would be throw into that parking market. Mr. Grado stated that if the same density were proposed between High Street and Pearl, he would welcome it, it would be supported by City adopted policy; any significant density would require the opening of 16th and 14th Avenues to High Street. Mr. Graver asked whether the applicants would consider opening up 16th. Mr. Szymanski stated that the opening of the Avenues would require more parties to be involved. The Board and Applicants discussed University policies and how it might influence the project. Mr. Szymanski stated that regardless of University policy, the project is being driven by the need take advantage of the opportunity now because the same opportunity may not be available two to three years from now. Mr. Goodman asked if there was any further comments.

Mr. Shannon summed up by stating that all the variances have been accounted for, though may not have been listed in a previous presentation to the UAC. Mr. Grado explained that the proposal as presented requires a variance from every University Area Planning Overlay; the proposal may adhere to the AR4 zoning but that is exactly why the overlay was created. Mr. Grado recounted the various down zonings that took place in the University District. Mr. Grado stated that the AR4 zone may have had its time but it has been destructive to the neighborhood. Mr. Shannon offered to make a condition of zoning clearance, that after the BZA makes their determination, the project will come before the UARB.

Mr. Shannon stated that as a City Attorney of another municipality it is his opinion that one should avoid the appearance of impropriety. Mr. Shannon mentioned that the two members should consider abstaining from the vote, though he stated he was not demanding such action. Mr. Ferdelman recounted two examples of true conflicts of interest and reiterated that it was his opinion that the two members had a conflict. Mr. Shannon stated that his client requested a vote today because the project will go before the BZA in January. Mr. Shannon explained that he was requesting two votes, one on the BZA case for the two larger residential structures and one for the CV which is an office and residential structure. Mr. Lupton described the program for the office/residential building. Mr. Horne asked whether there was some way to address the parking situation. Mr. Szymanski stated that if they could work out a TIF for the project to provide 100 additional spaces, they would. Mr. Horne stated that the Board is not objecting to the density of people, but the issue of traffic and parking needs to be addressed. Mr. Goodman asked that should they be successful in the variance process and they find away to add parking, would they need to go through the public process again? Mr. Shannon said no, they would not need to go through the process again. Mr. Shannon expressed his opinion that the Overlay did not contemplate a project like this. Mr. Goodman asked for a vote.

Mr. Grado inquired whether the applicants had any discussions with Campus Partners regarding the Log's site; he said that he would welcome this density on that site. Mr. Graver stated that Campus Partners will be putting out an RPF in the coming months.

motion	<b>To recommend the approval of the Variances for buildings A&amp;B as submitted to the BZA.</b>
motion by	<b>Mr. Graver / Mr. Horne</b>
vote	<b>3-1 To Approve (Mr. Kane, Ms. Uhas-Sauer abstained): motion failed for lack of minimum affirmative vote [C.C. 3372.581(C)].</b>

motion	<b>To recommend the approval of the Variances for building O as submitted to the City Council.</b>
motion by	<b>Mr. Graver / Mr. Horne</b>
vote	<b>4-0 to Approve (Mr. Kane, Ms. Uhas-Sauer abstained)</b>

C. **Staff Issued Certificates of Approval**

•	1509 Hamlet Avenue	roof
•	1610 Summit Street	resurface parking
•	1492 Indianola Avenue	porch/walkway and windows & door (fire damage)
•	1378 Indianola Avenue	roof
•	2134 Indianola Avenue	roof
•	2144 Indianola Avenue	roof
•	284 East14th Avenue	roof
•	300 East16th Avenue	roof
•	84 West 9th Avenue	roof
•	78 West 9th Avenue	roof
•	1843 North 4th Street	roof
•	1910 Summit Street	roof
•	212 East 14th Avenue	roof
•	104 East Norwich Avenue	roof
•	2112 Indianola Avenue	roof
•	110 East Norwich Avenue	roof
•	112 East 14 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	windows
•	113 West 8th Avenue	door
•	44 Euclid Avenue	roof

**D. Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval**

•	60 East 18 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (Addition)	addition approved 11/04/2010	issued 11/17/2010
•	2700 N. High Street (Graffiti Burger)	pole sign approved 11/18/2010	issued 11/19/2010
•	1716 N. High Street (Big Bar)	blade sign approved 11/18/2010	issued 11/30/2010
•	1426 North High Street (Cell Phone Repair)	wall sign approved 11/18/2010	issued 11/30/2010
•	1990 N. High St. (J Gumbo's)	wall sign approved 11/18/2010	issued 12/02/2010
•	93-95 East Woodruff Ave (Porches)	porches approved 11/18/2010	issued 12/02/2010
•	8 E. 15th Ave (i Bar)	wall sign approved 11/18/2010	issued 12/06/2010
•	255 Chittenden Avenue (East Village)	blade sign approved 11/04/2010	issued 12/10/2010

**E. Next Meeting**

- Thursday January 27, 2010 / 6:30pm / Northside Branch Library / 1423 North High Street